

24854A

## REMARKS

### Status of Claims

Claims 1-2, 6, 9, 10 and 12-15 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 10 and 12-15 stand rejected. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

### Rejection of Claims 1-2, 6-7 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 6, 9-10 and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dana et al. (U.S. 5,908,689) in view of Das et al. (U.S. 4,637,956).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that "the applied chemical treatment on the reinforcing fibers is from 5% to 30% by weight". No new matter has been added and support for the amended can be found in the specification at page 7, paragraph 2.

Nowhere do Dana et al. teach or suggest reinforcing fibers having an applied chemical treatment on the fibers from 5% to 30% by weight, as Applicants claim. Dana et al. specifically teach that the "weight of the sizing composition on the fibers....was about 2.15 weight percent" (col. 16, lines 23-27).

Nowhere do Das et al. teach or suggest reinforcing fibers having an applied chemical treatment on the fibers from 5% to 30% by weight, as Applicants claim. Das et al. specifically teach "The aqueous chemical treating composition was added to the glass fibers during their formation at such a rate of forming the glass fibers....to result in strands having a dried residue of around 0.1 to 3 weight percent of the aqueous chemical treating composition." (col. 13, lines 12-17).

Applicants claim (claim 1, as amended) a significantly higher percentage of treatment on the fibers than either Dana et al. or Das et al. Because neither Dana et al. nor Das et al. teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established.

24854A

Claims 2, 6, 9-10 and 12-15 ultimately depend from claim 1 (as amended) and contain the limitations thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 103(a) rejection of claims 1-2, 6, 9-10 and 12-15 be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims 1, 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 1, 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dana et al. (5,908,689) in view of Das et al. (4,637,956) and further in view of Eichhorn et al. (U.S. 4,596,736).

As argued above, neither Dana et al. nor Das et al. teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention, as amended

Because Dana et al. and Das et al. fail to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention (as amended); one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to combine Dana et al. in view of Das et al. further in view of Eichhorn et al.

Claims 4-5 ultimately depend from claim 1 (as amended) and contain the limitations thereof. Applicants respectfully request that the 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 4-5 be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10 and 12-15 at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' undersigned agent at (740) 321-7213 if any unresolved matters remain.

If any questions should arise with respect to the above Remarks, or if the Examiner has any comments or suggestions to place the claims in better condition for allowance, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' agent at the number listed below.

24854A

Applicant authorizes any fees required pertaining to this response be charged  
to Deposit Account No. 50-0568.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Maria C. Gasaway  
Maria C. Gasaway  
Reg. No. 51,721

Date: March 5, 2004

Owens Corning  
2790 Columbus Road, Bldg. 54  
Granville, OH 43023  
(740) 321-7213